

1
2
3
4
5 DENNIS SONG, et al.,
6 Plaintiffs,
7 v.
8 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
9 OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

10
11 Case No. 19-cv-02732-SBA

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 **ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 28

Plaintiff Dennis Song, DDS, MD ("Plaintiff" or "Dr. Song") brings this action against Defendants the Regents of the University of California, operating as the University of California San Francisco, School of Dentistry (the "University" or "UCSF"); Brian Bast; and John Featherstone (collectively, "Defendants").¹ Dr. Song served as a volunteer clinical professor at the School of Dentistry's Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (the "Department" or "DOMS") from 2007 to 2017. He alleges that Defendants retaliated against him by failing to renew his appointment for the 2017-2018 academic year after he engaged in activity protected under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. Presently before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Having read and considered the papers filed in connection with this matter and being fully informed, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendants' motion, for the reasons set forth below. The Court, in its discretion, finds this matter suitable for resolution without oral argument. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).

I. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS

Before summarizing the evidence, the Court addresses Defendants' evidentiary objections. Defendants argue that most of the exhibits offered by Dr. Song in support of his opposition brief

¹ The Complaint also names Tina Valaris as a plaintiff; however, her claims were settled by the parties at mediation. See Mot. at 1 n.1, Dkt. No. 28. Only Dr. Song's claims remain.

1 are inadmissible because they are presented through the declaration of counsel, as opposed to
2 witnesses, and thus lack foundation. Reply at 1-2 (citing Fed. R. Evid. 602), Dkt. 36. In making
3 this objection, Defendants rely on Clark v. County of Tulare, 755 F. Supp. 2d 1075 (E.D. Cal.
4 2010), wherein the district court stated that “[t]he Ninth Circuit ‘has consistently held that
5 documents which have not had a proper foundation laid to authenticate them cannot support a
6 motion for summary judgment.’” Id. at 1084 (citing Canada v. Blain’s Helicopters, Inc., 831 F.2d
7 920, 925 (9th Cir.1987)).

8 The standard set forth in Clark is outdated, however, as “Rule 56 was amended in 2010 to
9 eliminate the unequivocal requirement that evidence submitted at summary judgment must be
10 authenticated[.]” Romero v. Nev. Dep’t of Corr., 673 F. App’x 641, 644 (9th Cir. 2016); Dinkins
11 v. Schinzel, 362 F. Supp. 3d 916, 923 & n.25 (D. Nev. 2019); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 advisory
12 comm. note to 2010 amendment. The Rule now “mandate[s] only that the *substance* of the
13 proffered evidence would be admissible at trial.” Dinkins, 362 F. Supp. at 923 (emphasis in
14 original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(2) (“A party may object that the material cited to support or dispute
15 a fact *cannot be* presented in a form that would be admissible in evidence.”) (emphasis added).
16 Having reviewed Dr. Song’s exhibits, the Court is satisfied that they could be presented in
17 admissible form at trial. Defendants do not argue otherwise.

18 Accordingly, Dr. Song may rely on the exhibits in opposing summary judgment.
19 Nevertheless, for the reasons explained below, Dr. Song does not create a triable issue of fact.

20 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

21 **A. Non-Renewal of Dr. Song’s Appointment to DOMS**

22 Dr. Song began working as a volunteer assistant clinical professor for DOMS on August 1,
23 2007. Bonner Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. 5, Dkt. 35-2. He was eventually promoted to volunteer associate
24 clinical professor. Isvoranu Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. C (“Song Dep. A”) at 43:6-11, Dkt. 28-1. Dr. Song
25 volunteered one half-day per week, on Wednesday mornings, supervising dental students
26 completing clinical education. Id. at 57:7-22. Defendant Brian Bast, M.D., D.M.D. (“Dr. Bast”),
27 is DOMS’ Chair. Bast Decl. ¶ 2, Dkt. No. 28-2. Dr. Song is one of Dr. Bast’s former students,
28 and according to Dr. Bast, the two “got along.” Id. ¶ 3. Defendant John Featherstone, Ph.D.

1 (“Dean Featherstone”), was Dean of UCSF’s School of Dentistry from 2007 until his retirement in
2 December 2017. Featherstone Decl. ¶ 3, Dkt. 28-3. Dr. Song and his wife were former students
3 of Dean Featherstone, and Dean Featherstone considered himself a mentor to Dr. Song. Id. ¶ 4;
4 see also Opp’n at 4, Dkt. 35 (referring to Dr. Featherstone as Dr. Song’s mentor).

5 On May 8, 2016, Dr. Song sent Dr. Bast an email regarding concerns he had about patient
6 care and the quality of instruction in DOMS. See Bast Decl. ¶¶ 5, 8 & Ex. A at 1025-1027 (the
7 “May 2016 Email”). Dr. Song had previously discussed his concerns with Dr. Bast, but felt they
8 were not properly being addressed. Id. Among other things, Dr. Song raised concerns about gaps
9 in students’ predoctoral clinical knowledge, such as a lack of basic knowledge about antibiotic
10 prophylaxis, local anesthetic, and pain medications; poor execution and incomplete
11 implementation by the Department of a transition from paper to electronic medical records;
12 unsigned patient records and incomplete chart notes; and improper maintenance and functioning of
13 the Department’s nitrous oxide and oxygen systems. Id. According to Dr. Bast, he asked Dr.
14 Song to work with Jennifer Perkins, D.D.S., M.D. (“Dr. Perkins”) to resolve his concerns. Bast.
15 Decl. ¶ 8. Dr. Perkins is the Course Chairperson at DOMS and leads the Department’s efforts to
16 provide comprehensive didactic education and clinical training to students. Id. ¶ 7.

17 On April 7, 2017, Dr. Song sent Dr. Bast another email. Bast Decl. ¶ 9, Ex. A at 1023-
18 1025 (the “April 2017 Email”). He began:

19 *I am writing to inform you that I would like to take a leave*
20 *(sabbatical) from the Department starting July 1st, 2017.* It is with
21 great difficulty that I do this, as I have been faithfully teaching
22 clinically and didactically for the last 11 years, starting with my
23 chief resident year in our program. Much of enjoyment that I had
teaching students and residents has now been replaced by complete
fear of coming into the clinic and leaving frazzled having dealt with:
concern for patient safety and care, disorganized systems and
structure, and lack of appropriate training of students.

24 Id. (emphasis added). Dr. Song stated that he had reported his concerns about DOMS to
25 Dr. Perkins and that, while “some areas ha[d] improved,” most remained “unsolved.” Id. After
26 sharing his “continuing concerns” regarding DOMS, he concluded:

27 I realize that this is a complex issue logically, financially, and not
just within the department, but also the school. . . . *I cannot continue*
28 *in this fashion and watch the safety of patients and the education of*

students being compromised. . . . *I would like to return, but the teaching environment has deteriorated to the point that I need a break for the time being.* . . . I am happy to meet with you if feel [sic] it is necessary and/or appropriate.

Id. (emphasis added).

On April 7, 2017, Dr. Song sent an email to Sam Hawgood, Chancellor of UCSF (“Chancellor Hawgood”), forwarding his May 2016 and April 2017 Emails. See Bonner Decl. ¶ 11, Ex. 8. He added:

When I was a dental student, I was the school president and had aspirations to be in school administration and be dean of a dental school excited to instill a larger purpose for education. Maybe I still do, but in my lowly position, I have been powerless to effect any change and *at this point, planning to move on.*

I apologize for the length of these emails, but they are a result of years of neglect and frustration. I do appreciate any time you give to reading as *I felt it would have been unprofessional of me to leave without stating my concerns for the well[-]being of the students and university.* Thank you.

Id. (emphasis added).

According to Dr. Bast, he understood Dr. Song's April 2017 Email to convey that Dr. Song did not wish to volunteer in DOMS for the next academic year. Bast Decl. ¶ 18; see Isvoranu Decl. ¶ 2, Ex. A ("Bast Dep. A") at 60:5-21, 61:6-63:13. He responded to Dr. Song by email three days later, on April 10, writing:

Thank you Dennis for your thoughtful note. I am sorry to hear that you will be taking some time away from the school. We have considered all of your comments and remain committed to constantly improving the students [sic] education and training. I have discussed these issues with Dr. Perkins and Dean Featherstone. Please contact me directly with any further concerns. Always welcome your feedback.

Bast Decl. ¶ 10 & Ex. A at 1023.

Dr. Bast took Dr. Song’s concerns seriously and raised them with Dr. Perkins and Dean Featherstone. Bast Decl. ¶ 9. Dr. Bast forwarded Dr. Song’s April 2017 Email to Dr. Perkins and received a detailed response from her the next day. Id. ¶ 11, Ex. B. Dr. Bast forwarded Dr. Perkins’ response to Dean Featherstone on April 14, 2017. Id. ¶ 12, Ex. C. Dean Featherstone responded on April 14, 2017. Id. Dean Featherstone began by complimenting Dr. Perkins on her

1 efforts to improve “a situation that has needed improvement for a long time” and applauded both
2 Dr. Perkins and Dr. Bast for moving DOMS in the right direction. Id. He continued:

3 Unfortunately Dr. Song does not have the smoothest way in which
4 to communicate his opinions, observations and allegations. There
5 are always faculty who consider that everything was better in the
6 past, when it most likely was not. However, it seems that there are
7 some very important issues that need to be looked at.

8 I realize that the items listed in [Dr.] Song’s communications are his
9 opinions and they may not be the best way to do things. However, it
10 is a signal to make sure that our house is in order.

11 Please work out a plan of action and share it with me when you have
12 had a chance to work through it.

13 Id. Dr. Bast and Dr. Perkins conferred and came up with an action plan. Id. ¶ 15. In addition to
14 various action items, Dr. Bast committed to spending one-half day every other week in the clinic
15 to directly observe the process. Id. Dr. Bast forwarded the action plan to Dean Featherstone. Id.

16 Subsequently, on April 26, 2017, Dr. Bast sent an email to Dean Featherstone detailing a
17 series of complaints he and Dr. Perkins had received from students earlier that day. Bast Decl.
18 ¶ 20, Ex. G. He explained that earlier that afternoon, four students had reported to Dr. Perkins that
19 “Dr. Song had been very unprofessional and they were concerned about his behavior in clinic.”

20 Id. Dr. Bast and Dr. Perkins met with the students and listened to their concerns. Id. The students
21 reported the following:

22 1. Dr Song identified one of the 4th years who had matched into our
23 OMFS residency. He began telling her that she had made a mistake
24 in choosing this program. He informed her that all of the faculty in
25 this program didn’t know anything about the profession and that she
26 would not have a chance of receiving an adequate training. He
27 repeatedly told her that he felt sorry for her and that she had made a
28 large mistake. He also told her and the other students that “UCSF
Medical School sucks” and that UCD is a much better school. Dr.
Song graduated from UCD Medical School.

2. He repeatedly told the 4 dental students that he felt sorry for them
because they are going to a bad school. He told the students that the
faculty in the dental school “suck up” to the students because they
are only concerned about their evaluations.

3. He informed the students that our department is racist and sexist.

Id. The students further reported that they were “very uncomfortable and concerned,” that Dr.
Song “was repeatedly insulting the dental school faculty,” and that they felt his behavior was “very

1 unprofessional." Id. Dr. Bast expressed: "My own feeling is that Dr. Song should no longer be
2 interacting with our learners in any capacity. I understand that these are sensitive issues but when
3 this type of behavior touches our students in such a negative way we need to act." Id.

4 About a month later, on May 27, 2017, Dr. Bast emailed Dr. Song, saying:

5 In April you gave me notice of your desire to take a break from our
6 department starting July 1, 2017. I remain appreciative of all that
7 you have contributed to our student's education and training but I
8 also respect your decision. *I will plan to not renew your volunteer
faculty appointment with our department for the upcoming academic
year (2017-2018).*

9 Bast Decl. ¶ 18, Ex. F (emphasis added). On May 31, 2017, Dr. Song responded to Dr. Bast and
10 included Dean Featherstone on his email. He wrote, among other things:

11 *Please allow me to be clear, I did not ask to resign from my faculty
12 appointment. I am requesting transfer to the Department of
13 Orofacial Sciences and I would hope that you approve that without
14 difficulty. Please let me know if you have any questions or
15 concerns.*

16 Bonner Decl. ¶ 15, Ex. 12 (emphasis added).

17 Later that day, Dr. Bast forwarded Dr. Song's email to Dean Featherstone and expressed
18 his continued intent not to renew Dr. Song's appointment:

19 This note from Dennis was in response to an email I had sent him
20 last week. After you and I and Caroline had met I discussed Dennis'
21 request to leave my department. I was informed by HR that I would
22 need to give him a 30[-]day notice in email of the non-renewal of his
23 appointment. *My plan remains to not renew his appointment.*

24 He does ask in his email if I have any concerns. I do have major
25 concerns about any faculty that speaks to our students the way
26 Dennis has on many occasions. He has told our incoming resident
27 that she made a terrible mistake in choosing UCSF, that the medical
28 school is terrible and that her training would be inadequate. He has
told our students that he is sorry for them, that their education at
UCSF is not good.

29 I do not plan to respond to this email. *I do plan to not renew
30 Dennis' volunteer faculty appointment.*

31 Id. (emphasis added).

32 On June 20, 2017, after having had dinner with Dean Featherstone, Dr. Song sent an email
33 to Dean Featherstone stating, among other things:

1 To be clear, I did NOT ask to leave the University. I asked to take a
2 leave from [DOMS] for reasons and fears I have expressed this
3 evening and previously. I requested a transfer to the Department of
4 Orofacial Sciences where I can continue what I have been doing for
5 more than 10 years in a much more supportive environment. I did
6 not understand previously the nuances of this transfer, but I made
7 clear this evening my intent

8 Bonner Decl. ¶ 17, Ex. 14. According to Dr. Song, he was unaware prior to providing notice of
9 his intent to take leave that faculty appointments could end and not be renewed. Bonner Decl. ¶ 5,
10 Ex. 2 (“Song Dep. B”) at 242:16-243:8.

11 UCSF policy provides that leave-of-absence credit is earned only by faculty who work at
12 least half-time or meet other conditions that do not apply to volunteer positions. Bast Decl. ¶ 17,
13 Ex. E. To maintain a volunteer appointment, a professor must be willing to teach some number of
14 hours during an academic year. Id. According to Dr. Bast, the non-renewal of Dr. Song’s
15 appointment was consistent with this UCSF policy. Bast Decl. ¶¶18-19; Bast Dep. A at 22:19-25,
16 23:21-24:5, 61:6-63:13, 64:16-65:8, 66:10-19, 67:8-13. Dr. Bast avers that the decision “had
17 nothing to do with the concerns [Dr. Song] raised,” but rather, “with his leave notice.” Bast Decl.
18 ¶ 19. Additionally, based on the student complaints, Dr. Bast did not believe Dr. Song should
19 continue working with students, “as his behavior appeared to abandon his teaching duties as a
20 professor.” Id. ¶ 20.

21 Dr. Bast testified that appointments are “year-to-year.” Bast Dep. A at 64:16-25. In
22 response to a question of whether a volunteer can take leave and return, he indicated that the topic
23 “wasn’t in [] discussion” in his conversations with Dr. Song. Id. at 64:16-25, 65:6-8. Dr. Bast
24 never told Dr. Song that if he later “decided to come back, his appointment wouldn’t be renewed.”
25 Id. Dean Featherstone similarly testified that, although he assumed Dr. Song thought “sabbatical”
26 meant “to go away for a while and come back,” there is no UCSF “provision for volunteer faculty
27 to take a leave and come back.” Bonner Decl. ¶ 7, Ex. 4 (“Featherstone Dep. A”) at 49:18-50:7.
28 He explained that volunteer faculty are “never terminated; they’re not renewed.” Id. Volunteer
professors “give up their appointment” when they take a leave; “it’s possible for them to come
back on,” but they “have to start the appointment process over in that case.” Id. at 50:7-12.

1 **B. Denial of an Appointment to Pediatrics**

2 As mentioned above, at some point during his time at UCSF, Dr. Song took an interest in
3 working for another department in the School of Dentistry, the Pediatric Dentistry Division
4 (“Pediatrics”), within the Department of Orofacial Sciences. Isvoranu Reply Decl. ¶ 2, Ex. A
5 (“Shiboski Dep. A”) at 10:8-16, Dkt. No. 36-1. On October 5, 2016, he shared with Thuan Le,
6 D.D.S., Ph.D. (“Dr. Le”), then-director of Pediatrics, his interest in teaching in that division.
7 Bonner Decl. ¶ 20, Ex. 17. On March 30, 2017, he wrote to Dr. Le, stating that he “was planning
8 on leaving [DOMS],” and that he had been “offered a teaching position at UOP [University of the
9 Pacific]” and would “probably take it” but wanted to work with Pediatrics if they could offer him
10 a position. Isvoranu Reply Decl. ¶ 5, Ex. D.

11 Caroline Shiboski, D.D.S., M.Ph., Ph.D. (“Dr. Shiboski”), was Chair of Pediatrics. Defs.’
12 Shiboski Dep. at 11:17-20. She testified that it would be a “little bit unusual” for Dr. Song to
13 teach in Pediatrics because he is an oral surgeon and “there’s not a lot of need for . . . the specialty
14 of oral surgery” in Pediatrics. Id. at 12:2-7. Dr. Shiboski further testified that, although “it was a
15 bit of an unusual request” she was “willing to entertain” the possibility of offering Dr. Song a
16 “secondary appointment” in Pediatrics “because of Dr. Le’s acquaintance with Dr. Song’s wife
17 and because they seemed to know each other.” Id. at 12:2-12.

18 Ultimately it was Dr. Shiboski’s decision whether to offer Dr. Song a volunteer position in
19 Pediatrics, id. at 43:21-44:3, and she decided not to do so. Dr. Shiboski testified that when she
20 reached out to HR to inquire about making a secondary appointment, she learned that Dr. Song no
21 longer had a primary appointment with DOMS, and, as a result, if she gave him an appointment
22 with Pediatrics, it would have to be a primary appointment. Id. at 13:3-15, 64:13-19. A primary,
23 as opposed to secondary, appointment would incur “considerable” human resources fees; those
24 costs would be “kind of the initial stumble” to Dr. Song’s appointment. Id. at 13:3-15, 62:25-63:4.
25 Dr. Shiboski testified that this cost was her “primary reason” for not appointing Dr. Song, because
26 “when you run a large department . . . every expense counts.” Id. at 16:24-17:25.

27 Dr. Shiboski testified that, at around this same time, she also learned from Dr. Perkins and
28 Dr. Bast that Dr. Song had “expressed . . . a negative opinion about the residency program in

1 [DOMS] in front of students who had just been accepted to the program,” and “that kind of raises
2 a red flag.” Id. at 13:16-23; Bonner Decl. ¶ 24, Ex. 21 (“Shiboski Dep. B”) at 19:22-20:8. Dr.
3 Shiboski testified that, although she was happy to have Dr. Song continue as a guest lecturer, the
4 student incident was an “additional factor” in her decision not to offer him an appointment in
5 Pediatrics. Id. at 19:11-21.

6 **III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

7 On May 20, 2019, Dr. Song filed a Complaint for Damages, alleging seven causes of
8 action. Dkt. 1. The First through Third Causes of Action allege claims against Dr. Bast and Dean
9 Featherstone under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as follows: (1) Deprivation of First Amendment Right of
10 Free Public Concern Speech; (2) Retaliation in Violation of Civil Rights; and (3) Deprivation of
11 Property and Due Process. The Fourth through Seventh Causes of Action allege state-law claims,
12 as follows: (4) Violation of California Labor Code Section 1102.5, against UCSF; (5) Retaliation
13 in Violation of [California] Health & Safety Code Section 1278.5, against UCSF; (6) Intentional
14 Infliction of Emotional Distress (“IIED”), against Dr. Bast and Dean Featherstone; and
15 (7) Negligence [California] Government Code Section 815.2, against UCSF.

16 Although each claim is styled differently, the First through Fifth Causes of Action allege,
17 in essence, that Defendants terminated Dr. Song’s volunteer appointment in retaliation for
18 engaging in protected activity, i.e., raising complaints about DOMS. See id. ¶¶ 12, 29-61; id. ¶ 52
19 (“Dr. Bast effectively terminated Dr. Song’s faculty position because [he] complained about
20 substandard patient care and conditions of the dental school and risks to patient safety”). It is
21 alleged that, as a “further act of illegal retaliation,” Dr. Bast “blocked” Dr. Song from obtaining an
22 appointment in Pediatrics. Id. ¶ 53. The Sixth and Seventh Causes of Action also allege that
23 Defendants “engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct by retaliating against Dr. Song,” id.
24 ¶ 125, and breached their duty of care to Dr. Song by “terminating [his] employment,” id. ¶ 129.

25 On February 3, 2021, Defendants filed the instant Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt. 28
26 (“Mot.”). In accordance with a stipulated briefing schedule, Dr. Song filed his opposition brief on
27 March 29, 2021, Dkt. 35 (“Opp’n”), and Defendants filed their reply brief on April 5, 2021,
28 Dkt. 36 (“Reply”). The motion is fully briefed and ripe for adjudication.

1 **IV. LEGAL STANDARD**

2 A party may move before trial for summary judgment on some or all of the claims or
3 defenses presented in an action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Summary judgment is proper where there
4 is “no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of
5 law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). The party moving for summary judgment bears the initial burden of
6 identifying those portions of the pleadings, discovery and affidavits that demonstrate the absence
7 of a genuine issue of material fact. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). Material
8 facts are those that may affect the outcome of the case, and a dispute as to a material fact is
9 genuine if there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to return a verdict for the nonmoving
10 party. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).

11 If the moving party meets its initial burden, the opposing party must then set forth specific
12 facts showing that there is a genuine dispute for trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1); Anderson, 477
13 U.S. at 250. All reasonable inferences must be drawn in the light most favorable to the
14 nonmoving party. Olsen v. Idaho State Bd. of Med., 363 F.3d 916, 922 (9th Cir. 2004). However,
15 it is not the task of the Court “to scour the record in search of a genuine issue of triable fact.”
16 Keenan v. Allan, 91 F.3d 1275, 1279 (9th Cir. 1996). The nonmoving party has the burden “to
17 identify with reasonable particularity the evidence that precludes summary judgment.” Id. To
18 survive summary judgment, the nonmoving party “must set forth non-speculative evidence of
19 specific facts, not sweeping conclusory allegations.” Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4
20 Sys., Inc., 637 F.3d 1047, 1061 (9th Cir. 2011) (citations omitted).

21 “While the evidence presented at the summary judgment stage does not yet need to be in a
22 form that would be admissible at trial, the proponent must set out facts that it will be able to prove
23 through admissible evidence.” Norse v. City of Santa Cruz, 629 F.3d 966, 973 (9th Cir. 2010)
24 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(4) (“An affidavit or declaration used to support or oppose a motion
25 must be made on personal knowledge, set out facts that would be admissible in evidence, and
26 show that the affiant or declarant is competent to testify on the matters stated.”)).

1 **V. DISCUSSION**2 **A. Federal Retaliation Claims**3 Dr. Song brings three claims against Dr. Bast and Dean Featherstone under section § 1983,
4 alleging that they retaliated against him for raising complaints by terminating his appointment
5 with DOMS and blocking his appointment with Pediatrics.6 **1. Standard**7 “To establish a prima facie case of First Amendment retaliation, a plaintiff must prove that
8 (1) [he] engaged in protected speech; (2) the defendants took an adverse employment action
9 against [him]; and (3) [his] speech was a ‘substantial or motivating’ factor for the adverse
10 employment action.” Howard v. City of Coos Bay, 871 F.3d 1032, 1044 (9th Cir. 2017)
11 (quotation marks and citations omitted). If a plaintiff can demonstrate a prima facie case,12 the burden shifts to the employer to demonstrate either that, under the
13 balancing test established by Pickering v. Board of Education, 391
14 U.S. 563, 568 (1968), the employer’s legitimate administrative
15 interests outweigh the employee’s First Amendment rights or that,
16 under the mixed motive analysis established by Mt. Healthy City
School District Board of Education v. Doyle, 429 U.S. 274, 287
17 (1977), the employer would have reached the same decision even in
18 the absence of the employee’s protected conduct.19 Id. at 1044-45 (additional quotation marks, citations, and alterations omitted).²20 In their motion for summary judgment, Defendants do not dispute that Dr. Song engaged
21 in protected speech or that he suffered an adverse employment action. Rather, they argue that,
22 based on the undisputed facts, Dr. Song fails to show that his protected speech was a substantial or
23 motivating factor in any adverse employment action. Mot. at 11. Defendants likewise argue that,
24 based on the same undisputed facts, Dr. Song cannot refute the University’s showing that it would
25 have taken the same action even absent his alleged protected speech. Id.26

27 ² The parties analyze the First through Fifth Causes of Action as claims of retaliation. See Opp’n
28 at 10-23; id. at 10 (“There Are Triable Issues of Fact as to Dr. Song’s Retaliation-Based Causes of
Action (First through Fifth”). The Court therefore analyzes Dr. Song’s § 1983 claims under the
framework advanced by the parties and set forth above. The Court addresses Dr. Song’s claims
for retaliation under California law separately, below.

1 The question of whether protected speech was a “substantial or motivating” factor in an
2 adverse employment action is a question of fact. Eng v. Cooley, 552 F.3d 1062, 1071 (9th Cir.
3 2009). Mere evidence that the defendant was aware of the protected speech does not create a
4 genuine issue of material fact, however. Keyser v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist., 265 F.3d
5 741, 751 (9th Cir. 2001) (citing Bd. of Cnty. Comm’rs v. Umbehr, 518 U.S. 668, 685 (1996) (“To
6 prevail, Umbehr must show that the termination of his contract was motivated by his speech on a
7 matter of public concern, an initial showing that requires him to prove more than the mere fact that
8 he criticized the Board members before they terminated him.”); Gillette v. Delmore, 886 F.2d
9 1194, 1198-99 (9th Cir. 1989) (affirming partial summary judgment against employee because
10 evidence his employer “knew of his political activities” was “not sufficient to meet his burden”
11 where he had “shown no link between these events and his termination”).

12 Circumstantial evidence can create a genuine issue of material fact on the question of
13 retaliatory motive if the plaintiff “provides evidence that his employer knew of his speech *and*
14 further produces evidence of at least one of the following three types: (1) showing a proximity in
15 time between the protected action and the allegedly retaliatory employment decision such that a
16 jury logically could infer that the plaintiff was terminated in retaliation for his speech;
17 (2) demonstrating that his employer expressed opposition to his speech to him or to others; or
18 (3) showing that his employer’s proffered explanations for the adverse employment action were
19 false and pretextual.” Howard, 871 F.3d at 1045 (summarizing Keyser, 265 F.3d at 751-52)
20 (quotation marks and internal modifications omitted; emphasis added).

21 In analyzing the evidence of retaliatory motive, the Court turns first to the non-renewal of
22 Dr. Song’s appointment with DOMS, and then to the non-offer of an appointment in Pediatrics.

23 **2. Non-Renewal of Dr. Song’s Appointment**

24 In arguing that they are entitled to summary judgment, Defendants assert that
25 uncontested evidence shows the catalyst for the non-renewal of Dr. Song’s appointment was
26 his April 2017 Email, wherein he conveyed his decision to take an indefinite leave from his
27 volunteer position with DOMS as of July 1, 2017. Mot. at 13. Indeed, Dr. Song admitted that he
28 no longer wanted to work in DOMS when he sent his April 2017 Email. Id. Pursuant to

1 University policy, volunteer professors are ineligible for personal leave. Id. Leave-of-absence
 2 credit is earned only by faculty in specific positions and under limited circumstances, none of
 3 which apply to volunteer positions. Id. Thus, Dr. Bast avers, he decided not to renew Dr. Song's
 4 appointment with DOMS, in accordance with University policy, based on Dr. Song's leave notice.
 5 See Bast. Decl. ¶ 19. According to Dr. Bast, the decision had "nothing to do" with the concerns
 6 Dr. Song raised regarding DOMS. Id. In view of the foregoing, Defendants contend there is no
 7 dispute that the non-renewal of Dr. Song's appointment was "solely and legitimately motivated by
 8 [his] stated intent to take an indefinite break from working in ... DOMS." Mot. at 14.³

9 Dr. Song counters that there is a triable issue of fact regarding Defendants' true motives
 10 for, as he describes it, "terminating" his faculty appointment. Opp'n at 1. He argues that the
 11 record shows circumstantial evidence of temporal proximity and pretext. For the reasons
 12 discussed below, the record does not support Dr. Song's arguments; thus, he does not create a
 13 genuine issue of material fact on the question of whether the non-renewal of his appointment was
 14 motivated by his protected speech.

15 **a. Temporal Proximity**

16 "[T]iming can properly be considered as circumstantial evidence of retaliatory intent."
 17 Pratt v. Rowland, 65 F.3d 802, 808 (9th Cir. 1995). The Ninth Circuit has "reject[ed] any bright-
 18 line rule about the timing of retaliation," however. Coszalter v. City of Salem, 320 F.3d 968, 978
 19 (9th Cir. 2003) ("There is no set time beyond which acts cannot support an inference of retaliation,
 20 and there is no set time within which acts necessarily support an inference of retaliation.") Rather,
 21
 22

23 ³ As an alternative matter, Defendants argue that, even if there were a question of fact regarding
 24 Dr. Bast's motivations, there is no basis for Plaintiff's claims against Dean Featherstone because
 25 the uncontested evidence shows Dean Featherstone was not a decision-maker. Mot. at 14.
 26 Dr. Song argues there is a triable issue of fact as to whether Dean Featherstone "had the power to
 27 impact [his] appointment." Opp'n at 17. The evidence offered by Dr. Song does not support this
 28 assertion, however, and Dean Featherstone avers he did not have that power. Isvoranu Reply
 Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. C ("Featherstone Dep. B") at 72:17-73:6; Featherstone Decl. ¶ 11. In any event,
 because the Court finds that Dr. Song does not raise a triable issue of fact as to whether his
 protected speech was a substantial or motivating factor in the University's decisions, the Court
 need not reach Defendant's alternative argument regarding Dean Featherstone's role.

1 “[w]hether an adverse employment action is intended to be retaliatory is a question of fact that
2 must be decided in [] light of the timing and the surrounding circumstances.” Id.

3 Dr. Song argues, albeit in a cursory fashion, that the “sequence of events proves that [his]
4 request for leave or a sabbatical was simpl[y] a convenient way for Dr. Bast to disguise his
5 retaliatory intent.” Opp’n at 11. According to Dr. Song, “it is significant” that, on April 10, 2017,
6 he “forwarded his complaints” to Chancellor Hawgood, whereas “[p]rior to April 2017, [he]
7 reported his concerns only to Dr. Bast and Dean Featherstone.” Id. Given that Dr. Bast decided
8 not to renew his appointment on or about May 27, 2017, Dr. Song concludes that “Defendants’
9 retaliatory conduct certainly comprises ‘temporal proximity.’” Opp’n at 22. The Court finds this
10 argument unconvincing, as it ignores two crucial factors bearing on the timing of the non-renewal
11 of Dr. Song’s appointment.

12 First, Dr. Song ignores the temporal significance of the fact that he sent an email on April
13 7, 2017, informing Dr. Bast that he intended to stop volunteering with DOMS. Only *thereafter*, on
14 May 27, 2017, did Dr. Bast inform Dr. Song that his appointment would not be renewed for the
15 2017-2018 academic year. Defendants have shown that the non-renewal of Dr. Song’s
16 appointment, following the April 2017 Email, was in accordance with UCSF policy. Specifically,
17 Dr. Song could not have maintained his appointment while not teaching. Dr. Song does not rebut
18 the evidence regarding University policy. Pointing to his history as an alumnus, donor, and
19 volunteer, he asserts that it “simply defies reason that Dr. Bast would justifiably close the door on
20 a doctor with such a high level of engagement with the department, simply because he asked for a
21 sabbatical.” Opp’n at 11. Dr. Song’s opinion that the University undervalued his contributions is
22 not evidence of retaliatory motive, however. Given UCSF’s policies, the decision not to renew
23 Dr. Song’s appointment for the 2017-2018 academic year does not, in fact, defy reason.

24 Second, it is undisputed that Dr. Song raised his concerns regarding DOMS with Dr. Bast
25 in May 2016 (or, as both the May 2016 Email and the Complaint suggest, potentially even earlier),
26 at least a year before the allegedly retaliatory actions. He also shared his concerns with Dean
27 Featherstone and, at Dr. Bast’s urging, with Dr. Perkins. Dr. Song presents no evidence from the
28 time between May 2016 and May 2017 to support the inference that Defendants intended to

1 retaliate against him due to the concerns he raised regarding DOMS. Nor does he present any
2 evidence that Defendants responded to his concerns negatively, even after April 2017. To the
3 contrary, in May 2016, Dr. Bast asked Dr. Song to work with Dr. Perkins to resolve his concerns.
4 Dr. Song reported to Dr. Bast in April 2017 that he had been working with Dr. Perkins and that
5 “some areas ha[d] improved,” though not to an extent that Dr. Song found satisfactory. When Dr.
6 Song again raised his complaints in April 2017, Dr. Bast and Dr. Perkins worked to create an
7 action plan, which they shared with Dean Featherstone. This tends to show that UCSF was neither
8 dismissive of, nor hostile to, Dr. Song’s concerns.

9 Dr. Song’s speculation that the mere forwarding of his emails to Chancellor Hawgood in
10 April 2017 gave rise to a retaliatory motive is unsupported. In view of the forgoing, his attempt to
11 draw an inference of retaliation from the temporal proximity of his email to Chancellor Hawgood
12 and the non-renewal of his appointment, while ignoring the full timeline of events, is
13 unpersuasive. Considering the totality of the circumstances, the timing of the non-renewal does
14 not support an inference that Dr. Song’s protected speech was a substantial or motivating factor.

15 **b. Pretext**

16 Dr. Song also argues that the proffered reason for the non-renewal of his appointment was
17 pretextual. To create a triable issue of fact concerning retaliatory intent, Dr. Song must produce
18 either direct evidence of pretext, or specific, substantial circumstantial evidence. See Keyser, 265
19 F.3d at 753 n.5 (“Mere opinions and beliefs that [the employer’s] actions were retaliatory, based
20 on no specific or substantial evidence, are not enough to create a genuine issue of material fact on
21 the issue of pretext.”). Dr. Song fails to do either.

22 **i. Dr. Song’s Intent in Giving Notice**

23 Although Dr. Song does not explicitly frame it as evidence of pretext, he asserts that,
24 despite his April 2017 Email giving notice of his intent to take leave, Dr. Bast knew he wanted to
25 keep teaching. E.g., Opp’n at 12-13; id. at 5 (“Dr. Bast understood that Dr. Song’s request for a
26 sabbatical was an indication that he would not be teaching ‘for a period of time.’”). Dr. Song
27
28

1 asserts that he did not want to end his appointment, but merely “wanted a break” from DOMS. Id.
2 at 12. Dr. Song does not meet his burden of showing a triable issue of fact on this issue.

3 The record shows that, in his April 2017 Email, Dr. Song advised Dr. Bast of his intent to
4 take an indefinite “leave (sabbatical) from the Department starting July 1st, 2017.” Dr. Song
5 expressed that he had reached his decision “with great difficulty,” adding that he “would like to
6 return, but the teaching environment ha[d] deteriorated to the point that [he] need[ed] a break for
7 the time being.” Dr. Song did not definitively indicate *when* or *if* he wished to return. Separately,
8 on March 30, 2017, Dr. Song told Dr. Le that he “was planning on leaving [DOMS],” and that he
9 had been offered a teaching position someplace else and would “probably take it.” He also told
10 Chancellor Hawgood, on April 7, 2017, that he was “planning to move on” but “felt it would have
11 been unprofessional of [him] to leave without stating [his] concerns.” The foregoing evidence
12 belies Dr. Song’s assertion that it was “abundantly clear” to anyone at the University that he
13 “expressly wanted to continue with his faculty appointment.” Opp’n at 1. To the contrary,
14 Dr. Song has admitted that, when he advised of his desire to take leave in April 2017, he “no
15 longer wanted to work” at DOMS. Song Dep. A at 241:8-12.

16 In any event, whether Dr. Song’s statements to the University could reasonably have been
17 read as expressing an intent to return to teaching at DOMS at some unspecified point in the future,
18 they unequivocally expressed an intent *not* to teach for the *2017-2018 academic year*. Dr. Song
19 advised that he would not be teaching with DOMS beginning July 1, 2017. Accordingly, Dr. Bast
20 advised that he would not be renewing Dr. Song’s appointment for the 2017-2018 academic year.
21 Dr. Song does not contend that he ever asked to be appointed to DOMS for that academic year,
22 and there is no evidence that Dr. Bast refused such a request. Indeed, even when Dr. Song later
23 stated in emails to Dr. Bast and Dean Featherstone that he “did not ask to resign” from his faculty
24 appointment, he did not ask to remain with DOMS for the 2017-2018 academic year or to return to
25 DOMS for any academic year thereafter. See Opp’n at 13. Rather, he expressed his intent to be
26 appointed to another department. Id. As discussed below, however, any appointment to Pediatrics
27 was a separate matter, committed to the discretion of Dr. Shibuski.

1 Lastly, it is immaterial whether, as Dr. Song asserts, he failed to appreciate the
2 consequences of his request for leave, or whether Dr. Bast failed to promptly advise him of the
3 UCSF policy that prevented volunteer faculty from taking leave. Opp'n at 7. It is also immaterial
4 whether, as Dr. Song suggests, he “told Dr. Bast that he wanted to take leave, not because he
5 wanted to stop teaching but because he wanted to make a statement” Id. at 5. The pertinent
6 question is whether Dr. Bast honestly believed that Dr. Song intended to stop teaching in DOMS
7 as of July 1, 2017. See Villiarimo v. Aloha Island Air, Inc., 281 F.3d 1054, 1063 (9th Cir. 2002)
8 (“courts only require that an employer honestly believed its reason for its actions, even if its
9 reason is foolish or trivial or even baseless”) (quotation marks and citation omitted); see also
10 Risby v. Nielsen, 768 F. App’x 607, 611 (9th Cir. 2019) (even if the defendant’s decision “was
11 faulty in some way, an inference of pretext does not arise solely from an honest mistake”); Zamora
12 v. Elite Logistics, Inc., 478 F.3d 1160, 1166 n. 10 (10th Cir. 2007) (employee’s “subjective intent
13 is not relevant to the question of how the facts objectively appeared to . . . the decisionmaker”); id.
14 at 1166 (affirming summary judgment for employer because it could “have reasonably believed
15 that [the employee] had actually conditioned his return” on an ultimatum it was unwilling to
16 accept) (citing Gearhart v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 27 F. Supp. 2d 1263, 1276-77 (D. Kan. 1998)
17 (finding that, even if there was a disputed issue of fact as to whether the employee intended to
18 resign, summary judgment for the employer was appropriate where the employer reasonably
19 believed that the employee resigned, and the employee failed otherwise to offer sufficient
20 evidence that the employer’s asserted reason was pretextual), aff’d, 194 F.3d 1320 (10th Cir.
21 1999) (unpublished)). Dr. Song presents no evidence tending to show that Dr. Bast did not
22 honestly hold this belief.

ii. **Dr. Bast's Written Notice of Non-Renewal**

24 Dr. Song also notes that, on May 31, 2017, Dr. Bast sent an email to Dean Featherstone
25 stating that he had been “informed by HR that [he] would need to give [Dr. Song] a 30[-]day
26 notice in email of the nonrenewal of his appointment.” Dr. Song argues that “[t]he fact that
27 Dr. Bast went to HR to find out what he needed to do to terminate Dr. Song’s appointment and

then waited until the last possible moment to provide Dr. Song with notice, is specific, substantial evidence of pretext.” Opp’n at 12. The record does not support this assertion.

The events at issue unfolded over less than three months. On April 7, 2017, Dr. Song informed Dr. Bast that he no longer intended to teach as of July 1, 2017. Sometime between April 7 and May 27, 2017, Dr. Bast consulted with HR. In accordance with HR's directives, Dr. Bast then provided Dr. Song written notice of the non-renewal of his appointment on May 27, 2017, approximately 30 days before his appointment was set to end. Dr. Song's suggestion that the University somehow obfuscated by not informing him "at the earliest possible time about the implications and consequences of his requested leave," Opp'n at 12, is simply unfounded. Indeed, nothing in the correspondence between the parties suggests that Dr. Bast attempted to mislead Dr. Song as to the implications of his leave request.

Furthermore, any suggestion that Dr. Bast’s consultation with HR is itself evidence of pretext is unfounded. There is no evidence that Dr. Bast contacted HR prior to receiving Dr. Song’s April 2017 Email providing notice of his intent to stop teaching. Insofar as Dr. Song advised, *after receiving the 30-day notice from Dr. Bast*, that he did not ask to “resign,” Dr. Bast had no knowledge of that prior to his consultation of HR. Thus, there is no inference of a nefarious intent regarding Dr. Bast’s consultation with HR.

iii. Dr. Bast's "Plan"

Dr. Song also points to Dr. Bast’s statement in an email to Dean Featherstone that he did not “plan” to renew Dr. Song’s appointment. Opp’n at 8, 14. Based on the use of that word, Dr. Song argues that “Dr. Bast made it his ‘plan’ to terminate [his] appointment,” id. at 1, “irrespective of any attempts by Dr. Song to find an alternative placement in UCSF,” id. at 12. See also id. at 8 (“The decision to not renew Dr. Song’s appointment was solely a function of Dr. Bast’s ‘plan.’”). The Court is unpersuaded.

The natural reading of Dr. Bast's statement is that it was his "intent" not to renew Dr. Song's appointment in DOMS. Use of the word "plan" does not, as Dr. Song suggests, support the inference that Dr. Bast revealed to Dean Featherstone some scheme to terminate Dr. Song. If that were not obvious from Dr. Bast's email to Dean Featherstone, it is made obvious by

1 his May 27 email to Dr. Song, which was sent *after* Dr. Song's email expressing his intent to leave
2 DOMS and *before* Dr. Song's email stating that he would like to seek an appointment in another
3 department. Dr. Bast told Dr. Song: "I will *plan* to not renew your volunteer faculty appointment
4 with our department for the upcoming academic year (2017-2018)." (emphasis added).

5 **iv. The Student Complaints**

6 In their motion for summary judgment, Defendants further argue that the student
7 complaints about Dr. Song's behavior were "concerning" and "contrary to UCSF's values and
8 goals as a teaching hospital." Mot. at 15. According to Defendants, the students' complaints
9 about Dr. Song's behavior "further affirmed that [he] had abdicated his teaching duties as a
10 Volunteer Clinical Professor, consistent with his April 7, 2017 notice that he did not wish to teach
11 in the DOMS after July 1, 2017." Id.

12 Dr. Song contends that the alleged student complaints were "another pretext to hide
13 Defendant's retaliatory intent." Opp'n at 13. In support of this contention, he cites the lack of an
14 investigation by the University and the failure "to simply talk to [him] about the alleged student
15 complaints." Id. Separately, Dr. Song argues that any statements he made to the students were
16 protected speech and thus could not serve as a legitimate basis for his termination. Id. 15-16. He
17 further argues that evidence of the student complaints is inadmissible hearsay or double hearsay
18 because, according to Dr. Song, the statements are offered for the truth of the matter asserts, i.e.,
19 "that [he] no longer wished to teach." Opp'n at 14. These arguments are unsuccessful.

20 As a threshold matter, Dr. Song's hearsay objection is without merit. As Defendants
21 correctly note, evidence that an employer received complaints regarding an employee's conduct is
22 admissible to show the employer's state of mind. Haddad v. Lockheed California Corp., 720 F.2d
23 1454, 1457 (9th Cir. 1983) (citing Fed. R. Evid. 803(3)). When offered for that reason, the
24 evidence is non-hearsay because it is "not offered to prove the truth of the complaints." Id. (citing
25 Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)); see also Ramirez Rodriguez v. Boehringer Ingelheim Pharm., Inc., 425 F.3d
26 67, 76 (1st Cir. 2005) (evidence of statements concerning the employee's conduct were not
27 hearsay because they were not offered to prove that the employee had engaged in misconduct, but
28 rather, to show that his employer had reason to believe he had). Contrary to Dr. Song's assertion,

1 Defendants do not offer the statements for the truth of the matter asserted, i.e., that Dr. Song acted
2 unprofessionally, but rather, to show that they believed he had done so. That Defendants also
3 interpreted the complaints as further evidence that Dr. Song no longer wished to teach in DOMS
4 does not alter the analysis. The student complaints are not offered to show that Dr. Song had
5 abdicated his teaching duties, but rather, that Defendants believed he had done so.

6 Dr. Song's argument that his statements to students were protected speech also fails. To
7 demonstrate that his speech was protected, Dr. Song bears the burden of showing that it
8 "addressed an issue of public concern." Eng, 552 F.3d at 1070. "Speech involves a matter of
9 public concern when it can fairly be considered to relate to any matter of political, social, or other
10 concern to the community." Id. (quotation marks and citation omitted). Although the Ninth
11 Circuit has "defined the scope of the public concern element broadly," "there are limits."
12 Desrochers v. City of San Bernardino, 572 F.3d 703, 709-10 (9th Cir. 2009) (quotation marks and
13 citation omitted). "[S]peech that deals with individual personnel disputes and grievances and that
14 would be of no relevance to the public's evaluation of the performance of governmental agencies
15 is generally not of public concern." Id. (citations and quotation marks omitted). The same goes
16 for "speech that relates to internal power struggles within the workplace." Id. (citations and
17 quotation marks omitted). Furthermore, "when the subject matter of a statement is only
18 marginally related to issues of public concern, the fact that it was made because of a grudge or
19 other private interest or to co-workers rather than to the press may lead the court to conclude that
20 the statement does not substantially involve a matter of public concern." Johnson v. Multnomah
21 Cty., 48 F.3d 420, 425 (9th Cir. 1995).

22 Although Dr. Song claims that Dr. Bast's email misrepresented his statements to students,
23 Song Decl. ¶ 11, Dkt. 35-1, he does not dispute the general substance of what Dr. Bast reported.
24 He does not, for example, deny having told students that the faculty at UCSF "suck up" to students
25 or that the students "made a mistake" in choosing UCSF's program. Instead, although Dr. Song
26 avers that he does not remember exactly what he said, he purports to explain what he meant by the
27
28

1 statements.⁴ See, e.g., Song Decl. ¶ 7 (“If I told students that the faculty ‘suck up’ to the students
2 it was to warn them that they need to take their education into their own hands.”); id. ¶ 8 (“If I told
3 a student that he or she made a mistake by coming to UCSF, it could only have been to impress
4 upon them the need to have a wide range of experiences.”). The court “look[s] to what the
5 employee[] actually said, not what they say they said after the fact,” however. Desrochers, 572
6 F.3d at 711. The interpretations now proffered by Dr. Song are “not to be found” in the statements
7 attributed to him. Id. at 712 (citation omitted). Moreover, Dr. Song does not address the other
8 statements reported by students, e.g., that he “felt sorry for [them],” that UCSF is a “bad school,”
9 and that UCD—from which Dr. Song graduated, Song Dep. B at 32:4-8—is a “much better
10 school.” Given the nature of Dr. Song’s statements and the fact that he directed them to UCSF
11 students, they appear to be “animated” by his “dissatisfaction” with DOMS. Desrochers, 572 F.3d
12 at 715 (citation omitted). They cannot “fairly be considered to relate to a matter of public
13 concern,” id. at 709 (citations and quotation marks omitted), and thus, are not protected speech.

14 Turning to Dr. Song’s argument that the student complaints serve as a mere pretext for
15 retaliation, he notes that Dr. Bast did not speak with him about the complaints and that UCSF did
16 not conduct a full investigation. He argues that “[i]f the complaints were so concerning that
17 Dr. Bast was going to use the complaints as the basis to terminate [his] ten-year teaching career, it
18 would stand to reason that Dr. Bast would at least ask [him] to respond to the allegations.” Opp’n
19 at 14. But here again, Dr. Song mischaracterizes the record and Defendant’s arguments. In
20 moving for summary judgment, Defendants do not argue that the non-renewal of Dr. Song’s
21 appointment was based on any misconduct reported by the students. Mot. at 15. Rather, they
22 argue that “the students’ consistent reports of [Dr. Song’s] behavior further affirmed that [he] had
23 abdicated his teaching duties … consistent with his April 7, 2017 notice that he did not wish to

24

25 ⁴ The Court notes that the “mere assertion that [Dr. Song] does not remember” making certain
26 statements to students “is insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact.” Simpson v. Inter-
27 Con Sec. Sys., Inc., 2013 WL 1966145, at *5 (W.D. Wash. May 10, 2013) (citing Blanford v.
28 Sacramento Cty., 406 F.3d 1110, 1120 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding the district court properly took the
defendant’s account of events as true for purposes of summary judgment because the plaintiff’s
testimony that he “did not remember” particular acts was “not sufficient to allow a reasonable jury
to conclude that [he] did not do these things”).

1 teach in the DOMS after July 1, 2017.” Id. Indeed, although Dr. Bast appears to have considered
2 the student complaints, he avers that his decision not to renew Dr. Song’s appointment was based
3 on the April 2017 Email giving notice of Dr. Song’s intent to take an indefinite leave from
4 teaching and in accordance with UCSF policy that volunteer professors may not maintain an
5 appointment while not teaching. Dr. Song ignores the fact that he gave notice before the students
6 made any complaints. Since Dr. Song had already notified Dr. Bast of his decision to stop
7 teaching, and Dr. Bast cites that as the basis for his decision not to renew Dr. Song’s appointment,
8 Dr. Bast’s handling of the student complaints does not support an inference that the *basis* for his
9 decision was pretextual.

10 **3. Non-Appointment to Pediatrics**

11 Regarding Dr. Song’s claim that the decision not to offer him an appointment with
12 Pediatrics constitutes a further act of retaliation, Defendants argue that the uncontested
13 evidence shows Dr. Bast had no authority over that matter. Mot. at 14. Dr. Bast and Dr. Shiboski
14 both testified to this fact, which was confirmed by Dean Featherstone. See Featherstone Decl.
15 ¶ 11 (each department Chair has authority to make and renew appointments for his or her
16 department); Featherstone Dep. B at 72:17-73:6 (same). Dr. Shiboski was the ultimate
17 decisionmaker and she decided not to offer Dr. Song an appointment. Mot. at 14. Dr. Bast avers
18 that he did not prevent Dr. Song from receiving an appointment in Pediatrics. Bast. Decl. ¶ 21.

19 Dr. Song concedes that Dr. Shiboski had ultimate authority over whether to appoint him to
20 Pediatrics.⁵ He argues, however, that Dr. Bast was the “moving force behind the decision in [a]
21 protracted campaign to ‘blackball’ [him] within UCSF.” Opp’n at 17. Dr. Song asserts that Dr.
22 Shiboski decided not to offer him an appointment because Dr. Bast told her that Dr. Song “should
23

24

25 ⁵ To show Dr. Bast had some role in the matter, Dr. Song asserts that both Dr. Shiboski and
26 Dr. Bast would have to approve a move from DOMS to Pediatrics. Opp’n at 18. The record does
27 not support this, however. Dr. Shiboski testified that, if they were to “switch an appointment from
28 one department to the other,” then both chairs would “have to sort of approve this,” but since
Dr. Song’s appointment with DOMS had expired, she did not require Dr. Bast’s approval to
appoint Dr. Song to Pediatrics. Shiboski Dep. B at 39:11-40:4; see id. Shiboski Dep. A at 88:7-22,
103:25-104:8.

1 not be interacting with UCSF students.” *Id.* at 18. For the reasons set forth below, Dr. Song does
2 not raise a triable issue of fact as to this issue.

3 As an initial matter, Dr. Song ignores Dr. Shiboski’s testimony that her “primary reason”
4 for not offering him an appointment in Pediatrics was that he no longer had a primary appointment
5 with DOMS, and that providing him a primary (as opposed to a secondary) appointment in
6 Pediatrics would incur considerable costs. Dr. Song also ignores Dr. Shiboski’s testimony that she
7 was initially willing to consider offering him a secondary appointment because Dr. Le was
8 acquainted with Dr. Song’s wife, but that it would have been unusual for an oral surgeon, such as
9 Dr. Song, to teach in Pediatrics, because there is little need for such services in that department.
10 Dr. Song does not present any evidence that Dr. Shiboski’s *primary* reason for deciding not to
11 offer him an appointment was pretextual. His failure to contend with these facts is telling.

12 Regarding the student complaints, Dr. Shiboski testified that she learned of the incident
13 from Dr. Perkins and Dr. Bast. Although she was willing to have Dr. Song continue giving guest
14 lectures in Pediatrics, the student complaints served as an additional consideration in her decision
15 not to offer him an appointment. Aside from the mere fact that Dr. Bast informed Dr. Shiboski of
16 the student complaints, however, there is no evidence he “blocked” Dr. Song’s appointment to
17 Pediatrics or attempted to exert influence over Dr. Shiboski’s decision. The mere fact that
18 Dr. Bast informed Dr. Shiboski of the student complaints does not, standing alone, raise a triable
19 issue of fact as to whether he acted with retaliatory motive to block Dr. Song’s appointment to
20 Pediatrics, particularly where Dr. Song has failed to raise a triable issue of fact as to whether his
21 protected speech—the concerns he raised about DOMS to UCSF administration—was a
22 substantial or motivating factor in Dr. Bast’s decision not to renew his appointment in DOMS.

23 **4. Summary**

24 Dr. Song has failed to show that his protected speech was a substantial or motivating factor
25 in Defendants’ decisions not to renew his appointment with DOMS and/or not to offer him an
26 appointment with Pediatrics. Accordingly, Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on
27 Dr. Song’s First through Third Causes of Action.

1 B. State Retaliation Claims

2 Dr. Song also brings retaliation claims under California Labor Code section 1102.5(b) and
3 California Health and Safety Code section 1278.5. Labor Code section 1102.5, subdivision (b),
4 prohibits retaliation by “[a]n employer, or any person acting on behalf of an employer” against an
5 employee “for disclosing information to . . . a person with authority over the employee or another
6 employee who has the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance
7 . . . if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of
8 state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or
9 regulation” Cal. Lab. Code. § 1102.5(b). Health and Safety Code section 1278.5 prohibits
10 retaliation by a health facility or an entity that owns or operates a health facility against an
11 employee who “[p]resented a grievance, complaint, or report to the facility” regarding unsafe
12 patient care or conditions. Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1278.5(a), (b)(1)(A), 2; see also
13 Mendiondo v. Centinela Hosp. Med. Ctr., 521 F.3d 1097, 1105 (9th Cir. 2008) (“The statute
14 prohibits retaliation against any employee who complains to an employer or a government agency
15 about unsafe patient care or conditions.”).

16 The analysis under Labor Code section 1102.5 and Health and Safety Code section 1278.5
17 is in substance no different than the analysis for Dr. Song’s federal retaliation claims. To establish
18 a *prima facie* case of retaliation under either statute, a plaintiff must show that: (1) he or she
19 engaged in protected activity under the statute; (2) the employer subjected the plaintiff to an
20 adverse employment action; and (3) a causal link between the two. Akers v. Cnty. of San Diego,
21 95 Cal. App. 4th 1441, 1453 (2002) (citations omitted); Jadwin v. Cty. of Kern, 610 F. Supp. 2d
22 1129, 1144 (E.D. Cal. 2009) (citing Mendiondo, 521 F.3d at 1105 (“[Plaintiff] must allege facts
23 similar to her retaliation claims: that she was terminated based on her complaints”)). If the
24 plaintiff makes such a showing, the burden shifts to the defendant to show a legitimate, non-
25 retaliatory reason for the adverse action. Akers, 95 Cal. App. 4th at 1453; see also Armin v.
26 Riverside Cnty. Hosp., 5 Cal. App. 5th 810, 829 (2016) (citation omitted).

27 As stated above, the parties address the First through Fifth Causes of Action together,
28 without separate analysis of Dr. Song’s state-law retaliation claims. For the reasons discussed

1 above regarding Dr. Song's federal-law claims, see supra, Section V(A), Defendants prevail on the
2 state-law retaliation claims as well. Accordingly, Defendants are entitled to summary judgment
3 on Dr. Song's Fourth and Fifth Causes of Action.

4 **C. IIED Claim**

5 Dr. Song brings a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress against Dr. Bast and
6 Dean Featherstone. "A prima facie case of [IIED] 'requires (1) outrageous conduct by the
7 defendant, (2) intention to cause or reckless disregard of the probability of causing emotional
8 distress, (3) severe emotional suffering and (4) actual and proximate causation of the emotional
9 distress.'" Schneider v. TRW, Inc., 938 F.2d 986, 992 (9th Cir. 1991) (quoting Cole v. Fair Oaks
10 Fire Protection Dist., 43 Cal.3d 148, 155 n.7 (1987)). "Conduct, to be 'outrageous,' must be so
11 extreme as to exceed all bounds of that usually tolerated in a civilized society." Id. (quotation
12 marks and citations omitted).

13 Defendants argue that they are entitled to summary judgment on Dr. Song's IIED claim
14 because their alleged conduct was "not even improper," much less so extreme as to exceed the
15 bounds of that tolerated in a civilized society. Mot. at 16. Dr. Song counters that Defendants'
16 motion for summary judgment must be denied because he has presented evidence that they refused
17 to renew his appointment in retaliation for voicing concerns regarding DOMS. Opp'n at 23. He
18 again argues that "Dr. Bast's May 31, 2017 email provides conclusive evidence of ... ill will
19 towards [him]" because "[i]t was Dr. Bast's plan not to renew [his] appointment" regardless of his
20 request to continue in another department. Id.

21 For the same reasons discussed above, see supra, Section V(A), Dr. Song has not presented
22 a triable issue of fact on the issue of retaliation. Dr. Song thus fails to provide evidence that
23 Defendants' conduct was inappropriate, much less that it was "outrageous." Accordingly,
24 Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on Dr. Song's Sixth Cause of Action.

25 **D. Government Code section 815.2 Claim**

26 Dr. Song brings a claim for negligence against UCSF under California Government Code
27 section 815.2. Section 815.2 "imposes upon public entities vicarious liability for the tortious acts
28 and omissions of their employees." Becerra v. Cty. of Santa Cruz, 68 Cal. App. 4th 1450, 1461

1 (1998); Cal. Gov't Code § 815.2(a). It further provides that, “[e]xcept as otherwise provided by
 2 statute,” Cal. Gov’t Code § 815.2(b), “a public entity cannot be held liable for an employee’s act
 3 or omission where the employee himself or herself would be immune.” Becerra, 68 Cal. App. 4th
 4 at 1461. “[S]ection 815.2 simply applies principles of vicarious entity liability,” Caldwell v.
 5 Montoya, 10 Cal. 4th 972, 989 n.9 (1995); it does not create a substantive right of action, Hearns
 6 v. Gonzales, 2018 WL 1790800, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2018) (citations omitted).

7 Defendants argue that they are entitled to summary judgment on Dr. Song’s Seventh Cause
 8 of Action because section 815.2 does not create a substantive right of action. They further argue
 9 that Dr. Song “has not alleged any claim of negligence against Dr. Bast or Dean Featherstone in
 10 the first instance” to support a claim of vicarious liability against UCSF and that UCSF is immune
 11 from suit for claims of damages under the Eleventh Amendment. In response, Dr. Song contends
 12 that he has “more than reasonably stated a claim under Section 815.2.” Opp’n at 24. He appears
 13 to abandon any claim of negligence, however, and instead relies on section 815.2 to hold UCSF
 14 liable for the acts of its employees in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Id.⁶

15 As stated above, see supra, Section V(B), Defendants prevailed on Dr. Song’s claim for
 16 violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Accordingly, Defendants are entitled to summary
 17 judgment on Dr. Song’s Seventh Cause of Action as well.

18 **VI. CONCLUSION**

19 For the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendants’ Motion for
 20 Summary Judgment is GRANTED. Judgment shall be entered in favor of Defendants. This Order
 21 terminates Docket 28.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: 09/30/2021

24
 25
 26
 27
 28

 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
 Senior United States District Judge

29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 80546
 80547
 80548
 80549
 80550
 80551
 80552
 80553
 80554
 80555
 80556
 80557
 80558
 80559
 80560